

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are pending in this application.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brezina et al. (Brezina), U.S. Patent No. 6,705,769 in view of Kryzak, U.S. Patent No. 6,491,446 and Ono, JP 07-202357. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The alleged combination of Brezina, Kryzak and Ono fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least a microstrip line having a flexible insulating substrate, a signal line arranged on one side of the insulating substrate, and a grounding film arranged on the other side of the insulating substrate, and the microstrip line serves the impedance matching function, as recited in claim 1.

As the Office Action admits, the alleged combination of Brezina and Kryzak fails to disclose a microstrip line having a flexible insulating substrate, a signal line arranged on one side of the insulating substrate, and a grounding film arranged on the other side of the insulating substrate, and the microstrip line serves the impedance matching function, as recited in claim 1. However, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Ono fails to overcome at least this deficiency of Brezina and Kryzak, as applied to claim 1.

In particular, Ono lacks the required suggestion or motivation under 35 U.S.C. §103 to modify the alleged combination of Brezina and Kryzak to achieve the desired features as recited in claim 1. For example, Ono is directed to a flexible printed circuit board that has a double-layer structure, which is suitable for a high-speed signal transmission (paragraph [0017]. As Ono shows in Fig. 1, the flexible printed circuit board includes a male connector 11 and a female connector 12 that are not configured to connect between a light-emitting element or a light-receiving element in the electric circuit. Further, Ono only teaches that the noise generation may be suppressed by setting the loop size, namely the position and the number of through holes in the longer direction of a pattern so that the resonance frequency

becomes much higher than a signal frequency region (constitution). Ono does not teach that the flexible printed circuit board 1 achieves impedance matching.

Additionally, Ono does not suggest the desirability of the alleged combination because Ono fails to disclose that the printed circuit board 1 achieves impedance matching, that the microstrip line serves the impedance matching function, and that the printed circuit board 1 connects a section between the light-emitting element or the light-receiving element, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Ono lacks the required suggestion or motivation under 35 U.S.C. §103 to modify the alleged combination of Brezina and Kryzak to achieve the desired features as recited in claim 1.

Further, as MPEP §2143.01(V) states, "the proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose." The alleged combination of Brezina, Kryzak and Ono would render Brezina inoperable for its intended purpose because the flexible printed circuit board 1 of Ono is not configured to connect a section between the light-emitting element or the light-receiving element and the electric circuit while achieve impedance matching nor does the flexible printed circuit board 1 include a microstrip line that serves the impedance matching function. As discussed above, Fig. 1 of Ono shows a male connector 11 and a female connector 12 at both ends of the flexible printed circuit board 1 without any means for connecting to a light-receiving element or a light-emitting element. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not utilize the flexible substrate of Ono to modify the device of Brezina because that would render the device of Brezina inoperable for its intended purpose, which is to provide a flexible cable 60 that includes an electrical portion 62, a transfer portion 64, and an optical portion 66 (col. 3, lines 63-65).

Because the alleged combination does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claim 1, the alleged combination cannot possibly render obvious the subject matter of claims 2, 3, 4, and 15, which depend from claim 1, for the reasons discussed with respect to

claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hargis et al. (Hargis), U.S. Patent No. 6,792,171 in view of Kryzak and Ono previously relied upon. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ono fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hargis and Kryzak as applied to claim 1 for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the alleged combination of Brezina, Kryzak, and Ono.

Applicants' invention in claim 16 calls for an optical communication device, comprising a first substrate having a light-emitting element or a light-receiving element on one side of the first substrate; a second substrate having an electronic circuit to perform operation control of the light-emitting element or the light-receiving element; and a flexible substrate which connects a section between the light-emitting element or the light-receiving element and the electronic circuit while achieving impedance matching, the flexible substrate including a microstrip line having a flexible insulating substrate, a signal line connected to a transmission device on a transmission side arranged on only one side of the insulating substrate, a signal line connected to a receiving device on a receiving side arranged on only the other side of the insulating substrate, and the microstrip line serves the impedance matching function. The alleged combination of Hargis, Kryzak, and Ono fails to disclose these features.

Similarly, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ono also fails to overcome deficiencies of Hargis and Kryzak as applied to claim 16.

Because the alleged combination of Hargis, Kryzak and Ono does not disclose or suggest all of the features as recited in claims 1 and 16, the alleged combination cannot

possibly render obvious the subject matter of claims 1 and 16. Further, at least for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 16 as well as for the additional features recited, claims 2, 3, 4, and 6-14, which depend from claim 1, and claim 17, which depends from claim 16, are also not rendered obvious by the alleged combination of Hargis, Kryzak and Ono. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, Ono only discloses a first signal line 31 on one side and a second signal line 31' arranged on the other side (Fig. 2). However, Ono does not disclose that the one side is transmission side and the other side is a receiving side. The first signal line 31 of Ono may be connected to one transmission device as well as the second signal line 31' of Ono. In other words, the first signal lines 31 of Ono may include both signal lines connected to a transmission device or both single lines connected to a receiving device.

Applicants' device, on the other hand, includes a signal line connected to a transmission device and a signal line connected to a receiving device arranged on only the other side of the insulating substrate. Ono fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy  
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tbm

Date: January 30, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461